

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 93 04:30:35 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #74  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 25 Mar 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    74

Today's Topics:

    How can we create more third party agreements?  
        Maritime Mobile (3 msgs)  
        No Radios on Airlines  
    The next attack on hams? (6 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 1993 06:41:15 GMT  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!  
usenet.coe.montana.edu!news.u.washington.edu!saturn.wwc.edu!saturn.wwc.edu!  
frohro@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: How can we create more third party agreements?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If a small third world country had no regulations prohibiting third party  
traffic with the U.S., but there was no official third party agreement between  
the two countries yet, perhaps because the small country hadn't been around  
all that long, who in the U.S. could one direct the appropriate officials  
of the other country to contact to set up such an agreement, or who in the U.S.  
could we ask to pursue developing such an agreement? I would like as much  
specific information as I can get, especially addresses. Recently the  
Philippines was added to the third party agreement list; is anyone familiar with  
how that was done?

Rob Frohne

E. F. Cross School of Engineering  
Walla Walla College  
204 S. College Ave.  
College Place, WA 99324  
(509) 527-2075  
frohro@wwc.edu

-----  
Date: 24 Mar 93 08:15:11 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Maritime Mobile  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, lapin@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Gregory Lapin) writes:

>  
>1) During one QSO the op was excited about all the DX he had worked with  
>his HT while he was docked in the ports of non-US islands (British VI,  
>Dutch VI). Since he was not in international waters and had not gotten  
>reciprocal licensing, was he breaking their laws?  
>

Assuming that he did NOT actually have legitimate RECIPOP permission  
(not necessarily a good assumption!) then yes, he was breaking their laws.

One of the more popular (and expensive for us) free services provided  
by ARRL HQ is the Reciprocal Operating package. Actually there are  
unique ones for each country with whom we share a reciprocal operating  
agreement.

In any event, the FCC rules (and the ARRL FCC Rulebook for that matter)  
are very specific about those matters...

			Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
		---	The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
	uck		urder
			National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
-----			the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
	KY1T		Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.

-----  
lhurder@arrl.org    Prodigy - MGTS39A,    BIX - ARRL,  
                  MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"  
                  Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ)    -- Genie ARRL.HQ

-----  
Date: 24 Mar 93 20:14:58 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!  
stanford.edu!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Maritime Mobile  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

lhurder@arrl.org (Luck Hurder KY1T) writes:

>One of the more popular (and expensive for us) free services provided  
>by ARRL HQ is the Reciprocal Operating package. Actually there are  
>unique ones for each country with whom we share a reciprocal operating  
>agreement.

Even in countries which don't have explicit reciprocal op agreements, it's  
often a trivial thing to get a license, particularly in small countries.  
The algorithm I've used goes something like:

1. Find the capital city.
2. Find the main post office, or headquarters of the Postal, Telephone, and  
Telegraph authority.
3. Find the person in charge of regulating amateur radio.
4. Bring your original walletsize license and your passport.
5. Be nice. Remember, the next ham wanting to get a license depends on  
your behavior.

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

-----  
Date: Wed, 24 Mar 1993 22:45:27 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!  
ae674@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Maritime Mobile  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A couple weeks ago I posted a couple messages asking about licenses/  
services that can use the HF bands besides amateur radio. I will be  
receiving my technician license soon and am curious who else can  
use the HF bands and what the requirements for use are. What frequencies  
are set aside for maritime use? Assuming I have a general radio tele-  
phone license can I just go out in my boat and talk to any other  
similarly licensed individuals? What kind of use do maritime hf  
bands get these days? Can I operate digital modes on these bands?  
(I would really like internet access from my boat!!)

--

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 1993 20:30:30 GMT  
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpfcso!hplvec!  
scott@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No Radios on Airlines  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

> VOR is rather simple and robust, and microwave ILS is good.

Agreed on the VOR stuff, and I suppose that from a technical point of view that microwave is OK, but most aviation folks agree it's not terribly practical. Costs for smaller operators are prohibitive, and even the airlines appear to be balking. The demonstrated benefits simply don't justify the costs of upgrading either the aviation fleet, or existing precision approaches, including the VHF based ILS technology.

Remember folks, new technology doesn't need to just be better to be adopted, it generally needs to be better and cheaper. The existing stuff works, and believe it or not, generally works pretty well despite recent ridiculous press reports. Newer has to be \*MUCH\* better in order to justify replacing existing installed ground and air-based equipment, to say nothing of the enormous expense involved in designing, charting and certifying thousands of new instrument approach procedures based on the new equipment and technology. This is a \*BIG\* flywheel we've got moving here :-)

> The older  
> ILS systems operating at high HF are bad, and the MF airway markers are  
> nearly useless most of the time. Since those systems date from the 1920s,  
> I'm not surprised.

I've never even \*heard\* of such a thing as an HF ILS, and there's certainly nothing like that operational in the US. The VHF receivers in my NAV radios wouldn't know what to do with such a thing :-). A variation of what Gary calls an MF airway marker (commonly referred to as an NDB or Non-Directional Beacon in aviation terminology) is often used as one (minor) component of a complete ILS installation, but it is not used for final approach guidance for either course (localizer) or height (glideslope) information.

An entirely different kind of approach procedure, classified as non-precision, may be based on L/MF beacons. These NDB approaches may utilize the beacon element of the co-located ILS but are a completely different animal with higher visibility & cloud ceiling requirements. Their major purpose in much of the country is in torturing instrument

students as they are notoriously obnoxious to fly well, particularly in windy, turbulent conditions :-). In practice, they are typically used for final approach guidance at very small airports where they may be the only approach available, and as backup systems at larger airports.

Finally, L/MF beacons, while certainly outdated, are hardly useless in practice, especially for corporate and private flights to outlying areas. You need to understand their limitations, but they are still both useable and useful.

It is certainly true that one of the major short-term benefits of technology like GPS may be as a cheaper, more reliable alternative to NDB approaches at small airports and for enroute navigation in remote areas. But that doesn't mean L/MF beacons are useless or rarely used. Just ask any Alaskan bush pilot. Alaska, where L/MF beacons are the norm rather than the exception!

Scott Turner N0VRF scott@hplsl.LVLD.HP.COM  
HP VXI Systems Division  
Turbo Arrow N2134N "Baby"

-----  
Date: Wed, 24 Mar 1993 14:07:41 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewse!waco@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: The next attack on hams?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Having never been accused of being psychic, nonetheless I have a strange feeling where the next attack on amateur antennas and towers might come from. This occurred to me recently when I saw a news item on TV about the residents of a Chicago suburb fighting against the phone company installing a cell antenna atop a grade school. The reason for this is their fear of kids getting cancer from the RF. This is a result of the law suit and all the media hysteria about RF-caused cancer.

Then, in thinking how my neighbor tried to get me to remove my tower by filing an TFI complaint with the FCC, it dawned on me -- why not attack amateurs using the argument their radio transmissions cause cancer? Think this is far fetched? Well, just look at what seems to get people excited without having any understanding of the facts. As can be seen by news reports in this issue of cancer dangers from RF, as well as in anti-gun campaigns, etc., the facts are usually not allowed to get in the way of what people believe.

If this method of attack is attempted, current rules, regulations, laws and ordinances will probably do no good. Many municipalities have wording in antenna ordinances regarding safety of installation. With the mass hysteria

on the dangers of RF, how many village boards, etc., would not consider banning antennas if many residents pushed the issue of radio transmissions being a health hazard? My pessimistic guess is not many. "My neighbor has all these antennas sending out radio signals. I want him stopped before my children get cancer!" Think the powers-to-be will resist an appeal like this? Am I being alarmist? I hope not, but unfortunately in this country today more bizarre scenarios have taken place.

Being no lawyer but having observed how many laws and ordinances have been written without good foundation in fact, I don't believe my hunch is farfetched. I do believe we amateurs need to consider the possibility of this happening and begin planning what can be done to protect our hobby.

73,

John, WB9VGJ

```
#####
# John L. Broughton      snail mail: Room 1K-324      #
# AT&T                  1200 E. Warrenville Rd.      #
#                      P.O. Box 3045                 #
#                      Naperville, IL 60566-7045      #
#                      (708) 713-4319                 #
#                      e-mail: john.l.broughton@att.com #
#                      att!john.l.broughton          #
#                      ihlpe!waco                     #
#                      air mail (HF, VHF): WB9VGJ      #
#####
```

-----

Date: Wed, 24 Mar 1993 17:19:30 GMT  
From: amdcad!amdcl2!brian@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: The next attack on hams?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

(john.l.broughton) writes:

>  
> why not attack amateurs  
> using the argument their radio transmissions cause cancer? Think this is far  
> fetched?

No, John, this is completely reasonable. :-) I propose that we hams launch an offensive counter-attack immediately!

Let's agitate the police/EMS/fire/military folks to sue their employers for radiation poisoning!

Let's sue the TV/FM/AM/cell-phone companies!

Let's sue the electric utilities!

Let's sue the makers of electric blankets, VDTs, computers and CB's!

We could even go after the ubiquitous garage door opener!

[seriously, as far fetched an idea as it may be, let's hope our court system still has some common sense :-) ]

98% humor impaired,  
Brian McMinn, N5PSS    brian@amdcl2.amd.com

-----  
Date: Wed, 24 Mar 1993 19:24:29 GMT  
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!lapin@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: The next attack on hams?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar24.140741.25480@cbnewse.cb.att.com> waco@cbnewse.cb.att.com (john.l.broughton) writes:

>  
>Having never been accused of being psychic, nonetheless I have a strange  
>feeling where the next attack on amateur antennas and towers might come from.  
>This occurred to me recently when I saw a news item on TV about the residents  
>of a Chicago suburb fighting against the phone company installing a cell  
>antenna atop a grade school. The reason for this is their fear of kids  
>getting cancer from the RF. This is a result of the law suit and all the  
>media hysteria about RF-caused cancer.

In Wilmette, IL, Ameritech proposed placing their cell site in the steeple of a church. After having an independent power density survey performed, that showed that the amount of energy on the ground below the site was about the same as the amount of energy from TV Channel 50 at the site (Chnl 50 transmits from the Hancock Tower in Chicago, about 15 miles away), the church was convinced and supported the site (the rental fee that they would get didn't hurt, either). At the Village Board meeting, two hams from Wilmette spoke in support of the safety of the site and 8 residents spoke against it. From the naysayers came the proposal that ALL radio transmissions be banned within the village limits (except for police and fire). I got the impression that these were the nuts that escaped the squirrels and they will probably not be taken seriously.

>Then, in thinking how my neighbor tried to get me to remove my tower by filing  
>an TFI complaint with the FCC, it dawned on me -- why not attack amateurs

>using the argument their radio transmissions cause cancer? Think this is far  
>fetched? Well, just look at what seems to get people excited without having  
>any understanding of the facts. As can be seen by news reports in this issue  
>of cancer dangers from RF, as well as in anti-gun campaigns, etc., the facts  
>are usually not allowed to get in the way of what people believe.

>

>If this method of attack is attempted, current rules, regulations, laws and  
>ordinances will probably do no good. Many municipalities have wording in  
>antenna ordinances regarding safety of installation. With the mass hysteria  
>on the dangers of RF, how many village boards, etc., would not consider  
>banning antennas if many residents pushed the issue of radio transmissions  
>being a health hazard? My pessimistic guess is not many. "My neighbor has  
>all these antennas sending out radio signals. I want him stopped before  
>my children get cancer!" Think the powers-to-be will resist an appeal like  
>this? Am I being alarmist? I hope not, but unfortunately in this country  
>today more bizarre scenarios have taken place.

>

>Being no lawyer but having observed how many laws and ordinances have been  
>written without good foundation in fact, I don't believe my hunch is  
>farfetched. I do believe we amateurs need to consider the possibility of  
>this happening and begin planning what can be done to protect our hobby.

I fully agree with this - our legal system is very capable of being misused  
as you have suggested. When the cell phone cancer trials are over I expect  
that the brain tumors will lose and the whole thing will go away. As has  
been stated repeatedly in the rec.radio.amateur... groups, there is not one  
piece of conclusive scientific evidence that rf causes cancer -- not one!

Nevertheless, it would be a good idea for hams to arm themselves with the  
facts so that they can talk knowledgeably about the subject when it comes  
up.

>73,

>

>John, WB9VGJ

73,

Greg Lapin, KD9AZ

Assistant Professor of Neurology and Biomedical Engineering

PS. Check out sci.med.physics for an article on silica (sand) being named a  
carcinogen in California. What do you want to bet that the beaches will be  
no emptier?

-----

Date: 24 Mar 93 20:23:25 GMT



From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!gatech!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!stanford.edu!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!  
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: The next attack on hams?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The best defense at this point is to be sure that you meet the ANSI guidelines outlined in the back of the current ARRL Handbook.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

-----  
Date: 25 Mar 1993 01:48:09 GMT  
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa  
Subject: The next attack on hams?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar24.192429.15444@news.acns.nwu.edu> lapin@casbah.acns.nwu.edu  
(Gregory Lapin) writes:

>In article <1993Mar24.140741.25480@cbnewse.cb.att.com> waco@cbnewse.cb.att.com  
(john.l.broughton) writes:

>>

>>Having never been accused of being psychic, nonetheless I have a strange  
>>feeling where the next attack on amateur antennas and towers might come from.  
>>This occurred to me recently when I saw a news item on TV about the residents  
>>of a Chicago suburb fighting against the phone company installing a cell  
>>antenna atop a grade school. The reason for this is their fear of kids  
>>getting cancer from the RF. This is a result of the law suit and all the  
>>media hysteria about RF-caused cancer.

>

> [...]

>against it. From the naysayers came the proposal that ALL radio  
>transmissions be banned within the village limits (except for police and  
>fire). I got the impression that these were the nuts that escaped the  
>squirrels and they will probably not be taken seriously.

You think not, eh? Well, ask anyone who owns firearms how seriously these people are taken. These are the same people who think that guns up and shoot people, cause crime and kill babies, of their own volition. (ie, without any human causing them to do so) and are trying to legislate anyone who owns firearms out of town. "To protect the children" they say. Never mind the data which shows that firearm accidents due to mishandling/accidents in the home have been in steady decline for the last 20 years. You own a target rifle? Get out of town.

You own a radio transmitter? Not in "our town" you don't. Power

transmission lines? Not in my backyard, you don't. Police and fire excepted. I've heard this sooo many times before.

These are also the same people who believe the Alar-on-apples scare, the same people who have bought the global warming scare (lock stock and barrel) and generations ago are were the same people who bought the stories that masturbation would make you go blind. (or give you furry palms; reports vary)

Allow me to tell a relevant tale here:

I grew up in Vernon, NJ. Vernon has the unique distinction of being the first "electrically quiet" location outside NYC. So many communications companies (AT&T, Western Union, RCA, MCI) set up ground stations for their comm satellites there. The valley of the town has a couple dozen dishes over a 20-square mile area.

Well, when this "RF causes cancer" cruft first started making the rounds, you would not BELIEVE the fruitcake assertions being made. Claims of:

- Kids were getting irridated across town because the RF "bounced off clouds"
- Cows were getting "cooked in the field" (Vernon used to be a big dairy farming town)
- It was blamed for kids being born with Down's syndrome
- And PMS (no joke)
- And people getting cancer
- and on, and on, and on, and on.

The fruitcakes and nut then put so much pressure on elected officials that the politicos had no choice but to bring out the academic types for studies of the situation. So there were surveys of RF field strengths done around town, around the stations and around schools. And they came up with results which just about any ham reading this would easily predict: there were no indications of intense RF fields at any of these reading points. This would be immediately apparent to someone even casually acquainted with antenna theory, since all the ground stations were using large (10 to 25m) parabolic dish antennas, all pointed up at least 40deg off the horizon.

Well, this placated the fruits for awhile. I'm told that they are starting up again.

I know about this history first-hand, since I worked as an engineering intern at the RCA-Americom ground station in 1983 when the noise was the loudest; the study team(s) issued their report in early 1984. RCA's station was one of the hardest put upon by this noise, since they had the most transmitters of any station. (22 at that time).

The most disturbing thing about this period of time which sticks in my

memory was that many of the people who "followed the herd" on this RF-from-the-ground-station scare were people you might otherwise consider somewhat intelligent: school teachers, CPA's with kids, investment types who worked in NYC, a lawyer or two, farmers and so on. Personally, I found it hard to believe (but I've learned otherwise with age) how easily manipulated by the press and media most people are. Most people are truly not able to objectively and dispassionately analyze information they receive on a day-to-day basis for veracity.

>Nevertheless, it would be a good idea for hams to arm themselves with the  
>facts so that they can talk knowledgeably about the subject when it comes  
>up.

Yes, it would be best. But here are some observations I've made on while trying to educate people about firearms issues:

- Once the popular press starts blathering their noise, you're in a very uphill fight on two fronts: the press (who are causing the problem) and educating the people misinformed by the press. It doesn't matter how wrong the press are; once they see it in print or in a 30-second blurb on the local evening news, they think it is Gospel from Luke.
- If you use alot of facts and studies in trying to get your point across, you're going to watch their eyes glaze over. You have to force their mind open with a big point -- something like: "Can you show me a study that PROVES your assertion? PROVES. Not just read in the paper. Where is your evidence?"

They'll usually come up short. Now you can start introducing your pile of facts.

- If they use individual, specific instances (rather than stats) to argue their point, simply point out some ham who has been around radio for his entire life who is doing just fine. Even better if you can find a retired broadcast engineer who would like to tell people how long he worked in much higher strength fields than the people from the bleating herd will likely ever see.

dsa

-----  
Date: 24 Mar 93 18:05:39 EST  
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: The next attack on hams?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, brian@amdcl2.amd.com writes:

>(john.l.broughton) writes:  
>>  
>> why not attack amateurs  
>> using the argument their radio transmissions cause cancer? Think this is far  
>> fetched?  
>  
>No, John, this is completely reasonable. :-) I propose that we hams  
>launch an offensive counter-attack immediately!  
>  
>Let's agitate the police/EMS/fire/military folks to sue their  
>employers for radiation poisoning!

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
<<< Humor alert--the following is not meant seriously. >>>  
Of course, since RF exposure reduces as you move away from the source  
of radiation, maybe the correct approach is to argue that all ham  
antennas should be mounted atop towers of at least 120-foot height,  
and all ordinances or contracts/covenants that disallow such towers  
should be declared null and void. Further, since the cost of these  
towers is a hardship, government grants (hey, why not feed at the  
trough?) should be provided to any amateur wanting to put up a 120'  
tower.

-----  
Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org  
American Radio Relay League | Justice is being allowed to do whatever  
225 Main St. | I like. Injustice is whatever prevents  
Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #74  
\*\*\*\*\*